IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT CHHATTISGARH

WRIT PETITION No. 566/2001.

(WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION ON INDIA)

PETITIONER:

1. POONAM CHAND AGRAWAL
S/o Govindram Agrawal,
aged about 24 years,

2. SMT. KAMLA DEVI AGRAWAL
W/o Govindram Agrawal,
aged about 54 years,

Both resident of Samta Colony
Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

//Versus//

RESPONDENTS:

1. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH
Through Secretary,
Revenue Department
D.K. Bhawan, Raipur
(CHHATTISGARH)

2. THE SECRETARY
Revenue Department,
D.K. Bhawan, Raipur
(CHHATTISGARH).

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION ON INDIA

(22) Writ Petition

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

WP-226/227 Consid
of Judic
Other than Service matter

आदेश पत्रक

Single Bench

WP मामला क्रमांक 566 सन् 2001

Puncam Chand विरुद्ध State of Chhattisgarh

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	24.4.2001 Petitioners by Shri Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate. Respondent-State by Miss Sharmila Singhai, Govt. Advocate. Heard. Miss Singhai submits that the matter has been examined by the Collector and the Collector was pleased to reject the request of the writ petitioner for exchange of land in terms of Section 167 of the M.P. Land Revenue Code. It is also submitted by Miss Singhai that there is provision under which, if aggrieved by the order of the Collector, the writ petitioner should have gone to approach to the competent authority, instead the writ petitioner submitted some representation to the Secretary	GR 484/07 Petition of ..M Presented on with..... by Shri...M. it be checke ..... The petition drawn up, duly necessary doc and bea Let record of D.R

आदेश पत्रक (पुर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

Revenue Department and also the State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary of the Revenue Department.

Mr. Paranjpe submits that a direction be issued to the respondents to dispose of the representation within specified time. Miss Singhai submits that there is no room for this exercise in as much as the writ petitioner has not taken any grievance by way of revision or appeal before the Competent Authority against the order passed by the Collector.

In my view it is still open to the writ petitioner to approach the Competent Authority against the order of Collector dt. 8.3.2001. It appears remedy has to be sought under the relevant provisions prescribed in this regard.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties I am of the view that no direction is called for in the present case. Accordingly this writ petition is rejected. However, since the petitioner appears highly aggrieved by the order of rejection by the Collector, if the appropriate appellate forum is approached by the writ petitioner within a period of one month from today, the delay if any shall stand condoned.

Thakur.

Sd/-
Chief Justice

GRPRJ—FS/311—1/2001—50,000.